

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar as well as address the objection identified in item 6 on page 3 of the Office Action. Specifically, as requested in the objection, the abstract has been amended to correct the problems identified by the Examiner. No new matter has been added. Therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

II. Amendments to the Drawings

As mentioned above, proposed drawing amendments are submitted herewith under a separate cover letter.

Specifically, as requested in items 4 and 5 of the Office Action, figure 1 has been amended to be identified as prior art. Further, the specification has been amended to correctly identify the network 30.

These drawing amendments are editorial in nature and do not add new matter to the application.

III. Amendments to the Claims

Claim 9 has been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein in order to overcome the rejection discussed below in detail.

It is also noted that claims 1-11 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the term “the formed broadcast” does not have proper antecedent basis. This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to claim 9, since claim 9 has been amended to correct the problem identified by the Examiner. Specifically, claim 9 has been amended to replace the term “the formed broadcast” with the term “the created broadcast.” As a result, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-8, 10 and 11 were identified by the Examiner as containing allowable subject matter. Further, claim 9 was identified as being allowable once amended to overcome the above-

mentioned 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection. The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

As mentioned above, claim 9 has been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection. In addition, as mentioned above, claims 1-8, 10 and 11 have only been amended to make editorial revisions, such that the editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability.

Accordingly, in view of the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter as discussed above, it is submitted that claims 1-11 are allowable.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Takashi MIZUTA

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2009.11.10 15:29:38 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicant

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 10, 2009